

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-20 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1-2, 8-9, 14-15, and 19-20 have been amended, and no claims have been canceled or added in this Response.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner interview conducted on July 19, 2006 between Applicants' attorney and the Examiner. Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed the primary reference (Huang, U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2003/0071840) in relation to the claims rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants' attorney pointed out that Huang does not teach or suggest a plurality of "dissimilar" processors in a single computer system but, rather, teaches a network system with multiple computer systems that may or may not have dissimilar processors. The Examiner agreed with this reading of Huang. The Examiner suggested using a different word in place of "dissimilar," and the synonym "heterogeneous" processors was discussed as an appropriate term. While no agreement as to allowability of the claims was reached, the Examiner did agree that an amendment to the independent claims 1, 8, and 14 consistent with the limitations found in claims 2, 9, and 15, would avert a final office action in the next communication and that the allowability of the amended claims would depend on the Examiner's new search.

Drawings

Applicants note that the Office Action does not indicate whether Applicants' formal drawings are accepted (see paragraph 10 of Office Action Summary). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether Applicants' formal drawings, filed with the Application, are accepted.

Claim Objections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 19 and 20 were objected to as containing informalities. Applicants have amended these claims and corrected the noted informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 in the next Office Communication.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 8-9, and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated, and therefore unpatentable, over U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2003/0071840 to Huang et al. (hereinafter "Huang"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claims, 1, 8, and 14, have each been amended to include limitations formerly found in dependent claims 2, 9, and 15, respectively. As amended, the independent claims claim a method, information handling system, and computer program product for monitoring an operational thread using a service thread. Each of these independent claims includes limitations of:

- initiating the service thread on a computer system, wherein the computer system includes a plurality of heterogeneous processors, and wherein the service thread monitors a plurality of service events and executes on a first of the plurality of heterogeneous processors;
- invoking the operational thread on a second of the plurality of heterogeneous processors using the service thread, wherein the operational thread performs operational tasks; and
- monitoring the operational thread using the service thread.

The Office Action contends that each of these limitations is taught by Huang. However, a review of Huang reveals that this is not the case.

Huang teaches a system and method for providing a graphical user interface for monitoring a telecommunications network (see Title, abstract). While Huang does teach a “monitor” thread that can shut a process down and restart a process (see Huang, ¶ 83), Huang does not teach or suggest that the monitor thread or the process are operated on a computer system that includes a plurality of heterogeneous processors, as taught and claimed by Applicants.

The Office Action contends that Huang teaches a computer system that includes a plurality of dissimilar processors (i.e., heterogeneous processors), citing ¶ 43 of Huang to support the contention. Paragraph 43 of Huang reads as follows (with emphasis added):

[0043] The external systems interface 210 provides the mechanism in which the **network server 208 communicates with an external system 212**, such as a simulator network, a developing network, or an interface to a developed network. The external systems interface 210 exchanges control messages or commands with communication devices that are represented in the NDMS GUI 204 as network elements. These communication devices may include a signaling interface, a call processor, an interworking unit, a controllable ATM matrix, a switch, or some other type of communication device.

It is readily apparent from the cited section that Huang does not teach or suggest a computer system that includes a plurality of heterogeneous processors, as taught and claimed by Applicants. Instead, Huang teaches a *computer network* that includes *more than one computer system*. This is quite different from a computer system that includes a plurality of heterogeneous processors, as taught and claimed by Applicants.

Each of Applicants’ independent claims – 1, 8, and 14 – include the “heterogeneous processors” limitation and, therefore, each of these independent claims is allowable over Huang for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2, 9, and 15 have each been amended to include the limitation where the service thread and the operational thread operate on the same processor selected from

the plurality of heterogeneous processors. Again, because Huang fails to teach or suggest a plurality of heterogeneous processors, each of these dependent claims are also allowable over Huang for the reasons set forth above.

Claim Rejections – Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-7, 12-13, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious, and therefore unpatentable, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over Huang in view of U.S. Patent 6,966,015 to Steinberg et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. As an initial matter, Applicants note that the Office Action cited Steinberg as being U.S. Patent No. 6,996,015, rather than the actual patent number of 6,966,015. Applicants note that the correct patent number is listed in Form-892 (Notice of References Cited) that was included with the Office Action.

Applicants note that claims 5-7, 12-13, and 18-20 each depend, directly or indirectly, on claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are each allowable for the reasons set forth in the previous section. Therefore, claims 5-7, 12-13, and 18-20 are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable.

Claims 3, 10, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious, and therefore unpatentable, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over Huang in view of U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2002/0120886 to Nguyen et al. in further view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (5th Ed.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants note that claims 3, 10, and 16 depend on claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are each allowable for the reasons set forth in the previous section. Therefore, claims 3, 10, and 16 are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable.

Claims 4, 11, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious, and therefore unpatentable, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over Huang in view of U.S.

Patent Publ. No. 2004/0123188 to Srinivasan et al. in further view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (5th Ed.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants note that claims 4, 11, and 17 depend on claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are each allowable for the reasons set forth in the previous section. Therefore, claims 4, 11, and 17 are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383/
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742